## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant hereby requests acknowledgement of the Information Disclosure Statement

filed May 13, 2002.

In the specification, the second paragraph has been amended to correct minor editorial

problems. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 27-31, and 35-36 have been amended to further

particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention, and to correct

minor grammatical errors. Support for these changes may be found in the specification, page 19

lines 1-14. The text of claims 23-24 is unchanged, but their meaning is changed because they

depend from amended claims.

Claims 3-6, 10-13, 17-20, 25-26, and 32-34 have been canceled, without prejudice.

Objection to Figures

FIG. 4 stands objected to for failing to indicate reference number 395. This reference

number was inadvertently mentioned in the specification and the specification has been amended

to remove the reference number. Thus, applicant respectfully maintains that no amendments to

the figures are necessary.

Objection to Specification

The specification stands objected to for reference to a "tunnel selection configuration override attribute". This was an inadvertent mistake in the application, and represents another name for the "domain configuration override attribute". All instances of "tunnel selection configuration attribute" in the specification have been replaced by "domain configuration override attribute." Applicant apologizes for any confusion this may have caused.


Objection to Claims

Claim 29 was objected to for an incorrect reference to the definition of the RADIUS acronym. The claim has been amended to fix this error. Additionally, the specification has also been amended to fix a similar error.


Claims 31-36 were objected to for typographical errors with respect to claim dependencies. The Examiner was correct in his interpretation of the proper dependencies. Applicant has amended these claims to fix these errors, and apologizes for any inconvenience these typographical errors caused.


The 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 3, 10 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 17, 18, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention.

SV #165279 v1

Claims 3-4, 10-11, 17-18, and 25-26 have been canceled. With this amendment it is respectfully submitted the claims satisfy the statutory requirements.

## The First 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-4, 8-11 and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Jacobson et al.[1] in view of Alles et al.[2] among which claims 1, 8 and 15 are independent claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.),

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure.[3]

The Office Action states:

With respect to Claim 1, Jacobson teaches a method for controlling subscriber access (Col. 2 lines 7-17) in a network capable of establishing connections with a plurality of services (Col. 3 lines 57-63), comprising: receiving a communication from a subscriber using a first communication network coupled to a second communication network (Col. 3 lines 8-25 and lines 44-56), said communication optionally including a domain identifier associated with a service on said second communication network (Col. 11 lines 12-23); and authorizing said subscriber to access a service on said second communication network (Col. 14 lines 35-40), said authorizing

---

[1] U.S. Patent 6,044,402
[2] U.S. Patent 6,466,976

SV #165279 v1

based upon a domain configuration override attribute associated with a source of a

communication from a subscriber (Col. 14 lines 40-45 and Col. 18 lines 41-53).


### Jacobson does not teach a domain configuration override attribute

Jacobson describes a system where host computers are assigned blocking modes (see col.

14, lines 41-45). These blocking modes may be overridden by a blocking override table (see col.

15, lines 16-20). The blocking override policies "override the network address and protocol

blocking policies that are identified by the network address block list 202 and the remote and

local protocol block lists 204 and 206 for all of the protected host computers in the subnet 102-

1." (Col. 15, lines 21-26).


The present invention, however, includes a "domain configuration override attribute".

Jacobson's override policy has nothing at all to do with domains, but rather applies only to

overriding previous policies. The specification of the present invention clearly defines the

domain configuration override attribute as specifying that the domain indicated by the

communication is to be overridden with a domain indicated in the virtual circuit profile (see page

19, lines 9-11. "If a domain override attribute exists or if the PPP authentication packet does not

include a domain name (610), at 615, the domain is set to the domain indicated in the virtual

circuit profile."). This allows the system to automatically force a user on a particular virtual

circuit to exclusively tunnel to a single domain, hence preventing denial of service attacks.

Jacobson, however, would only be able to prevent a user from visiting a particular domain by

specifically blocking access to each host computer in the domain. That obviously would be an

unwieldy solution, requiring a large number of restrictive policies to be set up merely to prevent a

user from venturing outside of a single allowed domain. Thus, it is clear that Jacobson does not

have a domain configuration override attribute. If it did, it wouldn't wind up with such an

unwieldy solution.


<u>Jacobson does not teach "authorizing said subscriber to access only said service on said

network device located on said second communication network using one of a plurality of virtual

circuits, said authorizing based upon a domain configuration override attribute associated with

the virtual circuit used to receive said communication from said subscriber"</u>


Claim 1, as amended, includes the element "authorizing said subscriber to access only

said service on said network device located on said second communication network using one of

a plurality of virtual circuits, said authorizing based upon a domain configuration override

attribute associated with the virtual circuit used to receive said communication from said

subscriber." Jacobson, however, fails to teach or suggest this element. As described above,

Jacobson fails to teach the domain configuration override attribute. That argument will not be

repeated. However, even if it did teach the attribute, it does not teach authorizing the subscriber

to access only the service on the network device located on the second communication networks

based on the attribute. Jacobson mentions nothing about whether or not authorization to access a

host computer is exclusive or not, hence it does not teach authorizing the subscriber to access

<u>only</u> a particular service, in lieu of a different, requested service.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully maintains that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Claims 8 and 15 contain similar limitations as claim 1, and hence applicant respectfully maintains that these claims are also in condition for allowance. As to dependent claims 2-4, 9-11, and 16-18, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

## The Second 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 5-7, 12-14 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Jacobson in view of Alles and further in view of Loehndorf, Jr. et al.[4]. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5-7, 12-14, and 19-21 are dependent on claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively. The argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

## The Third 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 22-24 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Alles in view of Jacobson among which claims 22 and 30 are independent claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Contrary to what is stated in the Office Action, Jacobson does not teach or suggest "a calculator capable of determining whether the service associated with said virtual circuit matches

the service associated with said domain configuration override attribute." As described above, Jacobson does not teach a domain configuration override attribute. As such, it cannot teach the calculator defined in claim 22. Therefore, applicant respectfully maintains the claim 22 is in condition for allowance. Claim 30 contains a similar limitation, and thus applicant respectfully maintains that it is also in condition for allowance. As to dependent claims 23-24 and 31-32, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

## The Fourth 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 25-28 and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Alles in view of Jacobson, and further in view of Loehndorf. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 25-28, and 33-36 are dependent on claims 22 and 30, respectively. The argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

## The Fifth 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Alles in view of Jacobson as applied to Claim 23 above, and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

---

[4] U.S. Patent 6,094,437

SV #165279 v1

Claim 29 is dependent on claim 22. The argument set forth above is equally applicable

here. The base claim being allowable, the dependent claim must also be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition

for allowance.

## Request for Allowance

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into

condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this

application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated

below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1698.

SV #165279 vl

Application. No. 09/712,780
Amendment dated May 6, 2004
Reply to Office Action of February 9, 2004

Docket No. CISCO-3095

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP

Dated: 5|6|04

Marc S. Hanish
Reg. No. 42,626

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040

SV #165279 v1